



## ***For Immediate Release***

Contact: Ted Fisher  
Town of East Hartford  
Phone: 860-291-7202  
Cell: 860-817-8590  
[tfisher@easthartfordct.gov](mailto:tfisher@easthartfordct.gov)

### **EAST HARTFORD SUBMITS QUESTIONS TO PEARCE REAL ESTATE – AGENT FOR MMCT**

(September 26, 2016) **East Hartford, CT** – Following the process dictated by MMCT, last Thursday, the Office of East Hartford Mayor Marcia A. Leclerc emailed a series of questions to Pearce Real Estate, agent for MMCT – the Mashantucket Pequot-Mohegan joint venture currently undertaking a site search for development of a third Connecticut casino here in the greater Hartford area.

On September 16, MMCT announced that it was reopening its site search process to accommodate new expressions of interest from potential host communities that had not previously submitted, in addition to accepting supplemental submissions to existing proposals, of which the town of East Hartford is one. East Hartford's original 300+ page submission to MMCT was posted to the town's website on the day that it was submitted in mid-November 2015.

Maintaining her longstanding commitment to transparency and openness from day one of this process, today the Mayor is publicly releasing these questions to the local news media to enable public review and scrutiny. The questions submitted to Pearce Real Estate on Thursday by the town of East Hartford are below:

The town of East Hartford respectfully submits the following questions to MMCT and Pearce Real Estate for a response:

- (1) Given the fact that East Hartford already put forth a comprehensive submission in response to the original RFP, in what form should additional or supplemental information be submitted?
- (2) Will MMCT have additional questions to ask of interested municipalities above and beyond those contained in the original RFP?

- (3) According to an article published last weekend in the Journal Inquirer, Mohegan Chairman Kevin Brown was quoted as saying that, among the amenities needed for the new casino, is adequate space to house “2,000 slot machines and 150 table games.” To the best of our recollection, previous public statements from MMCT officials have indicated 50 table games as being in the program mix, in addition to slots. In a question formally submitted to Pearce Real Estate last fall relative to the prescribed breakdown of slot machines vs. table games, the corresponding response posted to Pearce’s Q&A website simply stated, “It is anticipated that more than 2,000 gaming positions will be required.” So, as you can see, there appears to be some discrepancy here. Therefore, is Chairman Brown’s latest declaration of 150 table games as part of the build out program correct or incorrect?
- (4) The original RFP required completion of a signed and notarized “Property Approval” form to be submitted as part of a municipality’s response, in effect formally declaring the consent of a property owner (and/or option holder) in having their property considered by MMCT, if said property was privately held. East Hartford strictly adhered to this stated RFP requirement in making our original submission. In at least one instance, a previously proposed site consisting of one or more properties was considered by MMCT obviously without submission of this required form from either the municipality or the property owner(s). Will submission of a “Property Approval” form be a requirement for new submittals not previously considered? Will submission of a “Property Approval” form now be required of interested municipalities that neglected to submit one as part of their original submission? Will MMCT still consider properties where no “Property Approval” form has been submitted?
- (5) The original RFP – which is still posted to Pearce’s website – clearly states, “The proposal may only be submitted by a Municipality that has identified one or more potential locations that could be the site of the new Facility” – a provision that was also mandated by the Connecticut General Assembly in its enabling legislation authorizing commencement of the site search process. Based on this edict dictated by the original RFP, East Hartford’s expectation was that any response received by MMCT without a prior municipal authorization – or not accompanied by a completed and notarized municipal approval to submit signed by an authorized town official – would be deemed as non-compliant and removed from consideration. Clearly that was not the case. In virtually every instance, bar none, a municipal authorization would require an affirmative vote of a city or town’s legislative body (City Council, Town Council, Board of Selectmen) authorizing a Mayor, First Selectman, Town Manager, or Town Administrator to submit on behalf of a city or town. To date, East Hartford remains the only

submitting municipality to have fully complied with this dictate. Just prior to the original response due date last November, MMCT changed that edict to “all interested parties are encouraged to respond with a submission that is as complete as possible,” thereby opening the door to any property owner (or other third-party) who wanted to submit to do so. MMCT’s rationale for this change, as posted on 10/30/15 to the Q&A section on Pearce’s website, states: “MMCT acknowledges that the date of the [upcoming] municipal elections [11/3/16] and the RFP deadline may not allow incoming elected officials sufficient time to participate in this stage of the process. All interested parties are encouraged to respond with a submission that is as complete as possible.” My question(s) -- with the 2017 municipal elections now more than a year away, the concern apparently raised by one or more municipalities last November should no longer exist or pose a problem for those interested in submitting. What then will MMCT’s position be relative to this matter in the reopened process? Will a municipal authorization be required from submitting parties as dictated by the original RFP and mandated by the Connecticut General Assembly?

- (6) Given the incident at Foxwoods recently and the fact that this venue will be a commercially authorized gaming facility (not operated on tribal or sovereign nation property), is it expected that MMCT will contract with the local police department to provide uniformed officers as part of MMCT’s interior security plan?
- (7) In the September 16, 2017 Press Release by MMCT regarding the “Tribes Reopen RFP” announcement it states the reopening of the RFP was to ensure the process is fair and transparent? Can the public expect to see all submissions posted and public?

###